



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/920,583	07/31/2001	L. Jeffrey Kapner III	K35A0795	5991

35219 7590 09/20/2006

WESTERN DIGITAL TECHNOLOGIES, INC.  
ATTN: SANDRA GENUA  
20511 LAKE FOREST DR.  
E-118G  
LAKE FOREST, CA 92630

EXAMINER

CHOWDHURY, SUMAIYA A

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2623

DATE MAILED: 09/20/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/920,583

Applicant(s)

KAPNER ET AL.

Examiner

Sumaiya A. Chowdhury

Art Unit

2623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1)  Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 July 2006.
- 2a)  This action is **FINAL**.
- 2b)  This action is non-final.
- 3)  Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4)  Claim(s) 1,3-13,15-26,28-38,45 and 47-52 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6)  Claim(s) 1,3-13,15-26,28-38,45 and 47-52 is/are rejected.
- 7)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9)  The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10)  The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a)  accepted or b)  objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11)  The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a)  All b)  Some \* c)  None of:  
1.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3.  Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5/5/06.
- 4)  Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5)  Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6)  Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

### DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-26,28-39, and 41-52 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

(a) Applicant argues in regard to the LaRocca reference, "A prior art reference must be considered in its entirety, i.e. as a whole, including portions that would lead away from the claimed invention." On page 14, 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph of the Remarks filed 7/6/06.

On page 13 of the prior Remarks filed 1/25/06, the Applicant argued that although the Examiner brought in the LaRocca reference to teach "a client terminal comprising a terminal controller for 'selecting a bundle of channels based upon a subscription matrix for the user'", the LaRocca reference does not teach this particular limitation. The Examiner used the Davis reference to teach the client terminal and used the LaRocca reference to teach the selecting of the bundle of channels. Although as recited in the claim, the client terminal comprises the particular features and functions, the claim does not state that the particular features and functions are exclusively performed at the set-top box.

In response to applicant's argument, the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981).

(b) Applicant argues "There is no teaching or suggestion that the client terminal makes the recommendation." on page 12, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph, of the Remarks filed 7/6/06.

See paragraph 4 of page 1 of the provisional application by Kikinis. "What is clearly needed...based on customer responses, out of the multitude of available packages could then generate suggestions for programming packages designed to appeal to him,..., **while avoiding for the customer the inconvenience of having to call into a call center**". Referring to page 2, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, "... the system would offer him a comparison of a small selection...of suitable options". Referring to page 2, 5<sup>th</sup> paragraph, "In some cases...**and therefore an inquiry into the main database is done**". From this, it is clear that the processing to generate recommendations is done mainly at the client terminal, unless in certain circumstances when he moves to another town.

(c) Applicant argues "Kikinis does not disclose or suggest that any bundle of channels is recommended upon the selection of a program guide entry that is for a non-subscribed channel" on page 12, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, of the Remarks filed 7/6/06.

Referring to page 3 of the provisional application of Kikinis, Kikinis states that the system notes that the customer has attempted to view or record programs from HBO, although he is not subscribed to HBO. Based on the customer's history of program viewing and attempts to view programs, the system then makes a recommendation of packages.

(d) Applicant argues "There is quite simply no teaching or suggestion in Kikinis that upon selection of a program guide entry that is for a non-subscribed channel... at least one bundle of channels is recommended for subscription by the user based upon a subscription matrix for the user and the selected program guide entry for the non-subscribed channel..." on page 12, 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph, of the Remarks filed 7/6/06.

See response to 1(c).

(e) Applicant argues "Applicant respectfully submits that nowhere does the original Kikinis provisional patent application teach or suggest a promotion display that is automatically presented as part of the program guide and that is selected by a preference engine of the client terminal based upon a user's viewing patterns".

See LaRocca, col. 9, lines 42-61 (promotion display that is automatically presented as part of the program guide), see Knudson, col. 4, lines 33-37, col. 4, line 65 – col. 5, lines 16, col. 5, lines 52-60 (promotion display is automatically presented as part of program guide), and see Kikinis paragraphs 3-4 page 3 of the provisional (packages of TV programming are recommended to the user for subscription based on user's past selection of programming).

(f) Applicant argues "There is no teaching or suggestion in Kikinis that a promotion display may be automatically presented as part of a program guide"

See response of 1(e).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1, 3-13, 15-26, and 28-38, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis (5822123) in view of LaRocca (6314572) and Kikinis.

As for claim 1, Davis discloses a client terminal (Fig. 1) connectable to a video distribution system (col. 9, lines 11-20) and a display device (27 – Fig. 1), the video distribution system provides program guide information to create a program guide that includes program guide entries for subscribed channels and non-subscribed channels, the client terminal comprising:

a video distribution system interface (11 – Fig. 1) to receive the program guide information - col. 9, lines 8-20;

a display interface (23 or 26 – Fig. 1 and 27 – Fig. 1) to display the program guide on the display device - col. 11, lines 9-16, col. 9, lines 14-21;

a user interface (29 – Fig. 1) to receive user input - col. 12, lines 4-10; and

a terminal controller (16 – Fig. 1) responsive to a subscription control program for:

a. in response to user input, selecting a program guide entry from the

program guide (col. 20, lines 9-11, lines 25-34, lines 49-54);

However, Davis fails to disclose wherein

- b. upon selection of a program guide entry that is for a non-subscribed channel
  - i. recommending at least one bundle of channels for subscription by the user based upon a subscription matrix for the user, the selected program guide entry for the non-subscribed channel, and available bundles of channels for subscription.
  - ii. accepting user input to select a bundle of channels for subscription by the user; and
  - iii. transmitting a subscription request for the selected bundle of channels to the video distribution system

In an analogous art, LaRocca discloses:

- b. upon selection of a program guide entry that is for a non-subscribed channel (col. 11, lines 25-30, lines 35-39, col. 10, lines 7-11)
  - i. selecting a bundle of channels for subscription by the user based upon a subscription matrix (col. 5, lines 29-41) for the user, the selected program guide entry for the non-subscribed channel, and available bundles of channels for subscription (The subsystems 142 – Fig. 1 and 144 – Fig. 1 maintain databases of specific customer subscription information (subscription matrix) which is used to facilitate dependent subscriptions - col. 5, lines 29-41. Therefore, if the user selects M subscriptions out of N services, the subscriber is provided the remaining services for free or at a discounted rate. It tracks the subscriptions of each subscriber and when a certain number is obtained in a category, the remaining services are available for free

Art Unit: 2623

or for a discounted fee – col. 13, lines 16-28. e.g. User selects children's programming (selected program guide entry). The remaining children's programming services (available bundle of channels for subscription) are made available for free or for a discounted fee. The remaining children's programming services are determined from the specific customer subscription information (subscription matrix). When the subscriber subscribes to dependent subscriptions, the system allows the subscriptions to be bundled into fixed packages containing a plurality of services for the advantage of providing programs to the user for free or at a discounted rate - col. 13, lines 16-27);

ii. accepting user input to select a bundle of channels for subscription by the user (col. 11, lines 35-67, col. 12, lines 58-60, col. 13, lines 30-35); and

iii. transmitting a subscription request for the selected bundle of channels to the video distribution system (The subscription information screen allows user to sign up for service. The subscription information screen may inform the user that service requested is a dependent service, implying that user may sign up for a bundle of channels - col. 11, lines 35-67)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Davis' invention to include the above mentioned limitation, as taught by LaRocca, for the advantage of providing programs for free or at a discounted rate (col. 13, lines 16-24).

However, Davis and LaRocca fail to teach:



Art Unit: 2623

- i. recommending at least one bundle of channels for subscription by the user based upon a subscription matrix for the user, the selected program guide entry for the non-subscribed channel, and available bundles of channels for subscription.

In an analogous art, Kikinis teaches wherein packages (bundles) of TV programming are recommended to the user for subscription based on user's past selection of programming to provide the user with recommendations of packages that the user is likely to select – (paragraph [0031]-[0033], [0009] in published application, and paragraph 4 (Based on the customer's history of programming viewing and attempts to view programs (of non-subscribed channels. ex. HBO), the system then makes a recommendation of packages.) on page 3, paragraphs 3 and 4 of the provisional application).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Davis and LaRocca's system to include recommending at least one bundle of channels for subscription by the user, as taught by Kikinis, for the advantage of providing to the user subscription recommendations which the user is likely to select.

Claim 26 contains the limitations of claim 1 and is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to that claim. Claim 26 additionally calls for the following:

Receiving user input at the client terminal (see Davis col. 20, lines 9-11, lines 25-34, lines 49-54)

Art Unit: 2623

Performing processing at the client terminal to recommend at least one bundle of channels (See paragraph 4 of page 1 of the provisional application by Kikinis. "What is clearly needed...based on customer responses, out of the multitude of available packages could then generate suggestions for programming packages designed to appeal to him,..., while avoiding for the customer the inconvenience of having to call into a call center". Referring to page 2, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, "... the system would offer him a comparison of a small selection...of suitable options". Referring to page 2, 5<sup>th</sup> paragraph, "In some cases...**and therefore an inquiry into the main database is done**". From this, it is clear that the processing to generate recommendations is done mainly at the client terminal, unless in certain circumstances when the user moves to another town).

As for claims 3, 15, and 28, Davis, LaRocca, and Kikinis disclose wherein the video distribution system after receipt of the subscription request for the selected bundle of channels verifies a user's credit with a billing system to determine whether the user's credit is approved or disapproved for the selected bundle of channels, the terminal controller or video distribution controller responsive to the subscription control program/further comprising code segments or steps for :

In particular, LaRocca discloses:

- a. receiving the approval or disapproval from the video distribution system (col. 12, lines 1-14); and
- b. if the user's credit is approved,

- i. updating the subscription matrix (subscription database) to reflect that the client terminal is now subscribed to the selected bundle of channels (col. 12, lines 9-22); and
- ii. authorizing access to the selected bundle of channels (col. 12, lines 21-25).

As for claims 4, 16, and 29, Davis, LaRocca, and Kikinis disclose wherein the subscription matrix is stored both locally at the client terminal and remotely at the video distribution system. In particular, Davis discloses wherein initially the microcontroller stores the subscription ordering information (subscription matrix) in a location in memory in the settop box. The subscription information can then be transmitted to the cable operator which is located remotely at the video distribution system – col. 20, lines 49-54.

As for claims 5, 17, and 30, Davis, LaRocca, and Kikinis disclose the claimed limitations. In particular, LaRocca discloses wherein the program identification codes for the channels subscribed to by the subscriber and terminal I.D are stored in the subscription database (subscription matrix) such that the subscriber can access their personal SOD service at any time– col. 13, lines 9-12. The subscription database contains customer specific information storing which type of service the subscriber is/not subscribed to enable the system to accurately control system access, and subscriber billing, and to facilitate dependent subscriptions. –(This allows the

Art Unit: 2623

subscriber to access their personal SOD service at any time and for enabling the system to accurately control system access, and subscriber and billing, and to facilitate dependent subscriptions. col. 5, lines 29-40).

As for claims 6, 18, and 31, Davis, LaRocca, and Kikinis disclose wherein the selected bundle of channels is the most cost effective bundle of channels having a subscription cost that is less than the subscription cost of individually subscribing to the non-subscribed channel. In particular, LaRocca discloses wherein the subscriber subscribes to dependent subscriptions, the system allows the subscriptions to be bundled into fixed packages wherein several of the services is provided for free or at a discounted rate - col. 13, lines 16-27.

As for claims 7, 20, and 33, Davis, LaRocca, and Kikinis disclose wherein client terminal further comprising the step/preference engine/code segments, wherein the preference engine/code segments selects program guide entries for non-subscribed channels for display in the program guide based upon a user's viewing patterns. In particular, Kikinis discloses wherein the client terminal recommends packages including programming based on customer's use-tracking program (step/preference engine/ code segments) which tracks customer's attempt to access unavailable programming (non-subscribed channels) – (paragraph [0031] - [0033] in published application and

Art Unit: 2623

paragraph 3 & 4 (Then in step 402 attempts by the customer...) on page 3 in provisional application) [Doing so, provides recommendations of channels which the user is likely to select based on user's past selections.]

As for claims 8, 21, and 34, Davis, LaRocca, and Kikinis disclose wherein the client terminal is coupled to the video distribution system by a link that provides a persistent connection. In particular, Davis discloses that the client terminal receives data from the video distribution system via cablecast which is a persistent connection - cablecast, cable line – col. 9, lines 12-16, lines 20-22.

As for claims 9, 22, and 35, Davis, LaRocca, and Kikinis disclose the claimed limitations. In particular, LaRocca discloses wherein the menu (500 – Fig. 5) includes a category for each listed channel (502 – Fig. 5) – (This is done to group channels into their respective categories to provide the user the ease of finding a desired channel. col. 10, lines 29-45).

As for claims 10, 23, and 36, Davis, LaRocca, and Kikinis disclose wherein a channel includes a computer network channel. In particular, Davis discloses wherein 64 – Fig. 6 corresponds to interactive services which require a computer network channel. e.g. home shopping, banking, or telephone use - col. 17, lines 39-44.

As for claims 11, 24, and 37, Davis, LaRocca, and Kikinis disclose the client terminal comprising selecting only a program of the program guide entry of a non-subscribed channel for subscription in selecting the bundle of channels. In particular, LaRocca discloses wherein the client terminal selects a program of the program guide entry of a non-subscribed channel for subscription in selecting the bundle of channels. e.g. Referring to col. 12 lines 38-65, a user is presented with a sports bundle. The user may only be interested in men's professional basketball and is provided the option of selecting that particular channel – col. 12, lines 58-67.

As for claims 12, 25, and 38, Davis, LaRocca, and Kikinis disclose wherein the client terminal wherein the video distribution system is a cable head end. In particular, LaRocca discloses wherein the video distribution system is a cable head end – (This enables a secure bi-directional flow of data between the client terminal and cable headend. col. 4, lines 63-67).

Claim 13 contains the limitations of claim 1 and is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to that claim. Claim 13 additionally calls for the following which Davis discloses:

a computer program (application software) embodied in a computer readable storage medium (SRAM, EEPROM 20 – Fig. 1) for use in a client terminal (Fig. 1) connectable to a video distribution system (col. 9, lines 11-20) and a display device (27 – Fig. 1), the video distribution system provides program guide information to create a

Art Unit: 2623

program guide that includes program guide entries for subscribed channels and non-subscribed channels, the computer program comprising code segments (software programming) to perform the method discussed above in claim 1. (The video distribution system provides program schedule information for **all (subscribed and non-subscribed)** television programs available in the operator's geographical market – col. 9, lines 8-20. The EEPROM is connected to the video distribution system through components 12-16 – Fig. 1, and is connected to the display device through 16, 23, 25A – Fig. 1. col. 9, lines 58-64).

As for claims 32. Davis, LaRocca, and Kikinis disclose the claimed limitations. In particular, LaRocca teaches:

- a. displaying a promotion for a bundle of channels (Fig. 4; col. 9, lines 30-55).
  - b. in response to user input, selecting the promotion display (col. 9, lines 40-55);
- and
- c. transmitting a subscription request for the bundle of channels to the video distribution system (col. 9, lines 55-65).

2. Claims 45, 47-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis in view of LaRocca, Knudson (6016141), and Kikinis.

As for claim 45, Davis discloses a client terminal (Fig. 1) connectable to a video distribution system (col. 9, lines 11-20) and a display device (27 – Fig. 1), the video

Art Unit: 2623

distribution system provides program information to create a program guide that includes program guide entries of channels, the client terminal comprising:

a video distribution system interface (11 – Fig. 1) to receive the program information - col. 9, lines 8-20;

a display interface (23 or 26 – Fig. 1 and 27 – Fig. 1) to display channels on the display device - col. 11, lines 9-16, col. 9, lines 14-21;

a user interface (29 – Fig. 1) to receive user input - col. 12, lines 4-10; and

a terminal controller (16 – Fig. 1) responsive to a subscription control program for:

a. in response to user input, selecting an entry from the various channels listed (col. 20, lines 9-11, lines 25-34, lines 49-54);

b. transmitting a subscription request for the selected service to the video distribution system – col. 20, lines 25-35.

However, Davis fails to disclose:

wherein the video distribution system provides promotion information that advertises a bundle of channels which is displayed to the user, from which the user selects a promotion display for a bundle of channels which is subsequently relayed to the video distribution system; and

wherein the promotion display is automatically presented as part of the program guide and is selected by a preference engine based upon a user's viewing patterns.

In an analogous art, LaRocca discloses:



Art Unit: 2623

the video distribution system (122 – Fig. 1) provides promotion information that advertises a bundle of channels (Fig. 4) which is displayed to the user – (col. 9, lines 30-55),

from which the user selects a promotion display for a bundle of channels which is subsequently relayed to the video distribution system – (col. 9, lines 42-61).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Davis' invention to include the video distribution system provides promotion information that advertises a bundle of channels which is displayed to the user, from which the user selects a promotion display for a bundle of channels which is subsequently relayed to the video distribution system, as taught by LaRocca, for the advantage of determining if the user has a subscription fee for the selected service.

However, Davis and LaRocca fail to teach wherein the promotion display is automatically presented as part of the program guide and is selected by a preference engine based upon a user's viewing patterns.

In an analogous art, Knudson teaches where the promotion (program package) display is automatically presented as part of the program guide – col. 4, lines 33-37, col. 4, line 65 – col. 5, line 16, col. 5, lines 52-60.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Davis and LaRocca's invention to include the above mentioned limitation, as taught by Knudson, for the advantage of allowing the user to

Art Unit: 2623

purchase a package at a combined discount rate as opposed to paying a high price by purchasing the programs separately.

However, Davis, LaRocca, and Knudson fail to teach wherein the program display is selected by a preference engine based upon a user's viewing patterns.

In an analogous art, Kikinis teaches wherein packages (bundles) of TV programming are recommended to the user for subscription based on user's past selection of programming to provide the user with recommendations of packages that the user is likely to select – (paragraph [0031]-[0033], [0009] in published application, and paragraph 4 (Based on the customer's history...) on page 3 of the provisional application).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Davis, LaRocca, and Knudson's system to include the above mentioned limitation, as taught by Kikinis, for the advantage of providing to the user subscription recommendations which the user is likely to select.

As for claim 19, Davis, LaRocca, and Kikinis disclose the claimed limitations.

In particular, LaRocca teaches:

c. transmitting a subscription request for the bundle of channels to the video distribution system – (col. 11, lines 35-67).

In particular, Kikinis discloses:

Art Unit: 2623

a. displaying a promotion display for a bundle of channels – (paragraph [0021], [0031] in published application and paragraph 3 & 4 (In step 203, ...exit via arrow 221) on page 2 of provisional application.)

b. in response to user input, selecting the promotion display – (paragraph [0022] in published application and paragraph 4 (select one package) of provisional application);

As for claim 47, Davis, LaRocca, Knudson, and Kikinis disclose the claimed limitations. In particular, LaRocca discloses:

the video distribution system after receipt of the subscription request for the selected bundle of channels verifies a user's credit with a billing system to determine whether the user's credit is approved or disapproved for the selected bundle of channels, the terminal controller responsive to the subscription control program for:

a. receiving the approval or disapproval from the video distribution system (col. 12, lines 1-14); and

b. if the user's credit is approved,

i. updating a subscription matrix (subscription database) to reflect that the client terminal is now subscribed to the selected bundle of channels (col. 12, lines 9-22); and

ii. authorizing access to the selected bundle of channels (col. 12, lines 21-25).

As for claim 48, Davis, LaRocca, Knudson, and Kikinis disclose the claimed limitations. In particular, Davis discloses wherein initially the microcontroller stores the

Art Unit: 2623

subscription ordering information in a location in memory in the settop box to update the local subscription matrix. The subscription information (subscription matrix) can then be transmitted to the cable operator which is located remotely at the video distribution system for billing purposes— col. 20, lines 49-54.

As for claim 49, Davis, LaRocca, Knudson, and Kikinis disclose the claimed limitations. In particular, LaRocca discloses wherein the program identification codes for the channels subscribed to by the subscriber and terminal I.D are stored in the subscription database (subscription matrix) such that the subscriber can access their personal SOD service at any time and without further payment – col. 13, lines 9-12. The subscription database contains customer specific information storing which type of service the subscriber is/not subscribed to – col. 5, lines 29-40.

As for claim 50, Davis, LaRocca, Knudson, and Kikinis disclose the claimed limitations. In particular, Davis discloses wherein the client terminal is coupled to the video distribution system by a link that provides a persistent connection (wires, cables, col. 9, lines 8-23).

As for claim 51, Davis, LaRocca, Knudson, and Kikinis disclose the claimed limitations. In particular, LaRocca discloses wherein the menu (500 – Fig. 5) includes a category for each listed channel (502 – Fig. 5) for categorizing channels- col. 10, lines 29-45.

As for claim 52, Davis, LaRocca, Knudson, and Kikinis disclose the claimed limitations. In particular, Davis discloses wherein 64 – Fig. 6 corresponds to interactive services which require a computer network channel. e.g. home shopping, banking, or telephone use - col. 17, lines 39-44.

### ***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sumaiya A. Chowdhury whose telephone number is (571) 272-8567. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri, 9-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chris Grant can be reached on (571) 272-7292. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SAC

  
**CHRISTOPHER GRANT  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800**